

Appl. No. : 10/776,439
Filed : February 10, 2004

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-16, 18-26, 28-39, and 40-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,914,727, to Horan (hereinafter "Horan"), et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,869,101, to Arimilli, et al. (hereinafter "Arimilli"). Claims 3 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horan and Arimilli in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,411, to Dye. Claims 13 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horan and Arimilli in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,118,462, to Margulis (hereinafter "Margulis"). Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horan, Arimilli, and Dye.

Claims 1, 14, 28, and 48

Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness a three-prong test must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references or in the knowledge generally available among those of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success found in the prior art. Third, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation to combine the references as suggested by the Examiner and that the cited references, even if combined, fail to describe or suggest all of the claimed limitations.

Horan is generally directed to a system for providing a logic chipset that functions between a bridge and a memory controller. In Horan, a central processing unit 102 is connected to a core logic chipset 204 through a memory bus 204. *See* Horan, col. 10, lines 47-49. As was recognized by the Examiner in the Office Action, Horan describes a single controller for controlling the main memory, i.e., memory interface and control 304.

Appl. No. : 10/776,439
Filed : February 10, 2004

Arimilli describes a symmetric multiprocessor system comprising multiple partial system memories 18a-18n and corresponding memory controllers 17a-17n. In Arimilli, each of the CPUs *includes* a memory controller 17b. *See* Figure 2 and col. 2, lines 6-8.

By this paper, Applicant has amended each of independent claims. For example, Claim 1, as amended, recites “wherein the first of the at least two memory controllers is configured to reroute requests for the other addresses to a second of the at least two memory controllers.” The Examiner stated that Horan teaches all limitations of Claim 1 except that Horan does not teach “at least two memory controllers for controlling a main memory.” With respect to this limitation, the Examiner cited Arimilli as teaching “a symmetric multiprocessor system comprising multiple partial system memories 18a-18n and corresponding memory controllers 17a-17n.” *Id.* However, Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere, including in the portions cited by the Examiner, does Aramilli teach or suggest that the “the first of the at least two memory controllers is configured to reroute requests for at least some of the other addresses to a second of the at least two memory controllers,” as recited by Claim 1, as amended. *See generally Aramilli.* Further this feature is neither taught nor suggested in the other references. In particular, in the Office Action, the Examiner relied upon Margulis as teaching “an enhanced [integrated] system controller 310 connected to [various devices including an advanced graphics port (AGP)334].” *Id.* at 6. The Examiner further relied upon Dye as teaching “an integrated memory controller comprising a single chip and including two memory control units for providing interface signals to communicate with respective banks of the system memory.” *Id.* Applicant submits that each of Margulis and Dye also fail to teach or suggest that “the first of the at least two memory controllers is configured to reroute requests for at least some of the other addresses to a second of the at least two memory controllers,” as recited by Claim 30 as amended. *See generally Margulis and Dye.* Thus, Applicant submits that the cited references, either individually or combination, fail to teach or suggest, at least, this limitation of Claim 30, as amended. Applicant thus submits that Claim 30, as amended, is allowable.

Claims 2-13, 15-27, 29-39, and 41-50

Since Claims 2-13, 15-27, 29-39, and 41-50, each depend on one of Claims 1, 14, 28, and 40, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above and the subject matter of their own limitations.

Appl. No. : 10/776,439
Filed : February 10, 2004


Summary

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 7/28/2005

By: 
Eric M. Nelson
Registration No. 43,829
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

1835248:emn1:sad2
072805